SUBJECT No. 36.

Recognition of the right of *shikmidars*.

Messrs. H. S. Gundappa, Patel Bale Gowda, Kunigal Taluk; Singri Nanjappa, Tiptur Municipality; Guruchannabasavaiya, Tumkur Municipality, and G. S. Murigappa, Gubbi Taluk.

Mr. H. S. Gundappa.—There are cases in which the *khate* of a land is in the name of one person, while there are many *shikmidars*. According to the Land Revenue Code, the *khatedar* is responsible for the *kandayam*. Patels and Shanbhogs receive *kandayam* from *khatedars* and sometimes from *shikmidars*. As the land is held in shares by several *shikmidars*, their rights should be recognised. Sometimes, notice given to *khatedars* who live elsewhere serves no purpose, as lands are brought to sale and the shikmidars are put to loss.

Revenue Commissioner.—*Shikmidars* can get their names entered in the Special Notice Register once in 5 years.

Dewan.—The representation is not very clear. The rule is that when a registered occupant who is primarily responsible for the land revenue fails to pay *kandayam*, it should be recovered from the inferior holder or person in actual possession of it. The name of the person who pays the *kandayam* is entered in the *khiridi*. I do not think that any thing more can be done now. When the system of Record of Rights is introduced, the question will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 37.

Defining the shares held, and the *kandayam* payable, by several persons in a *khate*.

Messrs. Javali Hutchappa, Tyamagondlu Municipality, and Hutcha Hanume Gowda, Nelamangala Taluk.

Mr. G. Paramasivaiya.—If a *khate* consists of several shares, the assessment payable on each share should be determined. At present, this apportionment is not shown in the *khate* and consequently the *hissedars* are put to great trouble. Suitable remedy should be found to remove the difficulty the raiyats are labouring under.

Mr. L. Vema Reddy.—To protect the interests of co-sharers in a land, their shares should be defined and the *kandayam* payable thereon fixed and the names of the several *hissedars* registered. Otherwise, poor raiyats will be put to much hardship. If necessary, fees may be levied for such sub-division and maintenance of accounts on this behalf.

Mr. Purushothamanandagiri Gosai.—Shanbhogs do not maintain correct accounts to show the *hisses* in a *khate*, and the names of the individuals in whose possession the particular lands are. They do not mention in the receipt the survey number for which *kandayam* is paid. Therefore *shikmidars* are put to much inconvenience.

Mr. Hanumantha Rao.—A Shanbhog cannot subdivide the several *hisses* and collect the *kandayam* on each *hisse* separately. He cannot also specify the survey number for which payment is made at the request of the payer. The *khatedar* and the *shikmidars* should both send a representation to the authorities concerned and obtain orders.

Mr. Abbas Khan.—*Shikmidars' hisses* need not be determined. Shanbhogs know the persons who pay *kandayam* for a *khate*. There should be a record to show the amount that each man pays.

Dewan.—Rules 73 and 75 of the Revenue Rules provide facilities for the recognition and registration of *hisses* as far as possible. It is not possible to break up a *khate*. If further facilities have to be created, a Record of Rights has to be maintained. This is not possible at present.